Jabmithed by Bruce Firestone



Economic Significance of Downhill Skiing and Snowboarding in Wisconsin Final Results

Prepared for Wisconsin Ski Industries Association, Mt. Horeb, WI Prepared by RRC Associates, Boulder, CO August 3, 2011

Introduction

This report provides a brief summary of selected economic and operational measures of the Wisconsin ski resort industry. The report primarily draws on ski resort operator survey data and ski visitor survey data collected by the National Ski Areas Association (NSAA), along with selected economic data sources and literature. In addition, where data specific to Wisconsin is not available, RRC Associates has utilized documented economic factors for the Midwest or the U.S. generally, as described in the report.

This analysis focuses on the economic activity associated with downhill skier/snowboarder expenditures during skiing/snowboarding trips. Expenditures associated with non-trip-related spending on skiing/snowboarding, such as purchases of equipment not occurring during a ski trip, are excluded. Additionally, expenditures associated with snowsports participation other than downhill skiing and snowboarding (e.g. expenditures associated with cross-country skiing and snowshoeing trips) are excluded.

RRC Associates, a 20-person firm based in Boulder, Colorado, specializes in providing market research and consulting services to the ski industry, with experience conducting economic and demographic research for such industry participants as NSAA (including the annual Economic Analysis of United States Ski Areas), Colorado Ski Country USA, Ski Utah, other state/regional ski associations, and numerous individual ski resorts.

Background facts about Wisconsin ski areas

- Number of resorts: A total of 32 ski areas operate in Wisconsin, per NSAA records (Table 1 to follow). Wisconsin has the third most ski areas of any state (after New York 52 areas and Michigan 43).
- <u>Number of skier visits</u>: Wisconsin ski areas hosted an estimated 2.28 million skier visits in the 2010/11 winter season, or an average of approximately 71,000 visits per ski area. A skier visit is defined as one person visiting a ski area for all or any part of a day or night for the purpose of skiing, snowboarding, or other lift-served downhill riding (but excluding snowtubing). Wisconsin

ranks ninth among states nationally in the number of resort skier visits, and ranks second in the Midwest (behind Michigan).

Table 1 Wisconsin Ski Areas, 2010/11

SKI AREA	CITY
Alpine Valley Resort	East Troy
Ausblick Ski Area	Sussex
Bruce Mound Sports Area	Neillsville
Camp 10 Ski Area	Rhinelander
Camp Forest Springs	Westboro
Cascade Mountain	Portage
Christie Mountain Ski Area	Bruce
Christmas Mountain Village	Wisconsin Dells
Crystal Ridge	Franklin
Devil's Head Resort & Convention Center	Merrimac
Fox Hill Ski Area & Club	Milwaukee
Grand Geneva Resort	Lake Geneva
Granite Peak at Rib Mountain State Park	Wausau
Heiliger Huegel Ski Club	North Lake
Hidden Valley Ski Area	Two Rivers
Highlands of Olympia	Oconomowoc

SKI AREA	CITY
Kettlebowl Ski Area	Antigo
Keyes Peak Ski Hill	Florence
Mont Du Lac, Inc.	Superior
Mt. Ashwabay	Bayfield
Mt. La Crosse	La Crosse
Navarino Slopes	Shiocton
Nordic Mountain Ski Area	Wautoma
Nutt Ski Hill	Plymouth
Powers Bluff	Arpin
Standing Rock Ski Area	Stevens Point
Sunburst Ski Area	Kewaskum
Trollhaugen Winter Recreation Area	Dresser
Tyrol Basin Ski & Snowboard Area	Mt. Horeb
Whitecap Mountain	Montreal
Whitetail Ridge Ski Area	Fort McCoy
Wilmot Mountain	Wilmot

Source: NSAA.

Characteristics of visitors to Wisconsin ski areas

<u>Day/overnight visitor mix:</u> Based on data from 15 Wisconsin resorts participating in NSAA's Kottke National End of Season Survey and/or National Demographic Survey in 2010/11 or in recent past seasons, approximately 28 percent of skier visits at Wisconsin ski resorts are estimated to be attributable to overnight visitors (persons spending one or more nights away from home during their trip), while 72 percent are attributable to day visitors.

The day/overnight visitor mix is important from an economic impact standpoint, since overnight visitors typically spend more on their trips than day visitors (e.g. additional expenditures on lodging, meals, entertainment, etc.), and thus have a larger economic impact.

Geographic origin: Based on data from six resorts participating in NSAA's National Demographic skier/snowboarder survey in 2010/11 or in recent past seasons, slightly over half of visitors to Wisconsin ski areas are Wisconsin residents (53 percent). The remaining 47 percent are out of state visitors, led by Illinois (34 percent of visitors) and Minnesota (9 percent), with the remaining 5 percent of visitors from other states and foreign countries. Because this data is derived from visitor surveys completed at only six resorts, however, these results should be used with caution.

Geographic origin is also important from an economic impact standpoint. Out-of-state visitation provides a particularly important economic boost, since it brings new dollars into the state, much like other "base" industries. However, the ability of Wisconsin areas to serve in-state residents is also important in keeping associated economic activity within the state. If Wisconsin did not have

- ski areas, many Wisconsin skiers would likely travel to other states to ski and snowboard, and Wisconsin would consequently lose the benefit of the associated economic activity.
- <u>Day/visitor mix by geographic origin:</u> The day/overnight mix varies by skier origin. Based on data from six resorts, Wisconsin visitors to Wisconsin ski resorts are predominantly day visitors (81 percent). Additionally, most Minnesota visitors to Wisconsin ski areas are also day visitors (70 percent). By contrast, a comparatively low share of Illinois visitors to Wisconsin ski areas are day visitors (40 percent), while most are overnight visitors (60 percent). Based on the available data sample, Illinois thus stands out as an important overnight visitor market for Wisconsin ski areas.

Methodology for Estimating the Economic Impact of Wisconsin ski areas

The economic activity associated with Wisconsin ski areas can be segmented into two major areas:

- <u>Direct economic activity</u> associated with skier spending: i.e. economic activity derived from skier purchases during their trips, e.g. lift tickets, lessons, rentals, retail sales, dining, lodging, gasoline, etc.
- Indirect and induced economic activity associated with ski trips: i.e. the "secondary" or "multiplier" effects attributable to the respending of dollars generated by skier spending, e.g. purchases by businesses that directly serve skiers from their suppliers (indirect effects), and the respending of income earned by employees working for businesses that directly or indirectly serve skiers (induced effects).

Estimates of economic activity are provided below, for visitor expenditures, industry output (sales), employment, and income. For industry sales, employment and income, estimates are generated for both direct and secondary economic effects.

The estimates of economic activity described below utilize consumer expenditure and resort operator revenue factors collected via NSAA research. Additionally, to derive output, employment, income, and secondary effects, generalized ratios and multipliers were used, based on published norms in the tourism economic impact literature.¹

Sales (Output) Impacts of Skiing

Expenditures by skiers: Table 2 to follow summarizes the estimated expenditures by downhill skiers and snowboarders at Wisconsin ski resorts in the 2010/11 season. In total, skiers and snowboarders were estimated to spend approximately \$233 million in the 2010/11 season, or an average of approximately \$103 per skier visit. Overnight visitors staying in commercial accommodations are estimated to have significantly higher expenditure levels on a per-skier-visit basis (\$172) than day visitors (\$78) and visitors staying overnight with friends/family or in vacation homes (\$130), based on NSAA Demographic survey research of skiers/snowboarders interviewed at four Wisconsin resorts.

¹ Stynes, D.J. (2010), as quoted in Crompton, J.L. (2010), *Measuring the Economic Impact of Park and Recreation Services*, National Recreation and Park Association, Ashburn, VA, p. 37.

Table 2
Estimated Expenditures by Skiers/Snowboarders at Wisconsin Ski Resorts, 2010/11

	Percent of	Number of E	stimated Spending	Aggregate
	Skier Visits	Skier Visits	per Skier Visit	Spending
Day visitors	72.0%	1,638,088	\$78	\$127,770,878
Overnight - friends/family or second home	4.2%	95,555	\$130	\$12,422,169
Overnight - commercial accommodations	23.8%	<u>541,479</u>	<u>\$172</u>	\$93,134,414
Overall average	100.0%	2,275,122	\$103	\$233,327,461

Source: Visitor mix at Wisconsin ski resorts is estimated at 72 percent day visitors and 28 percent overnight visitors, based on NSAA Demographic Survey data and NSAA Kottke Survey data for 15 Wisconsin resorts. Of the 28 percent overnight visitors, an estimated 4.2 percent stay overnight with friends/family or in vacation homes, while 23.8 percent stay in commercial accommodations, based NSAA Demographic survey research at four resorts in Wisconsin. Average spending per skier visit is based on NSAA Demographic survey research at four resorts in Wisconsin.

Share of expenditures accruing to resort operators and other businesses: Table 3 below illustrates the approximate share of skier expenditures in Wisconsin that are estimated to be captured by Wisconsin ski resort operators. Midwestern ski resorts are estimated to garner an average of approximately \$49.51 in winter-season revenue per skier visit, based on the 2009/10 NSAA Economic Analysis of U.S. Ski Areas (inflation-adjusted to 2010/11 based on the Midwest Consumer Price Index). Assuming that Wisconsin ski resorts share the same financial characteristics as Midwestern ski resorts as a whole, Wisconsin ski area operators are estimated to have grossed approximately \$113 million in revenue in 2010/11, or approximately 48 percent of total skier expenditures. The remaining 52 percent of expenditures, or approximately \$121 million, are estimated to have accrued to other businesses, illustrating that many of the economic benefits of ski trips are captured by the wider business community.

Table 3
Share of Skier Expenditures Captured by Wisconsin Ski Resort Operators and Other Businesses 2010/11

	Revenue per Aggregate		Share of
	Skier Visit	Revenue	Revenue
Estimated resort operator revenues ¹	\$49.51	\$112,641,772	48%
Estimated revenues accruing to other businesses	<u>\$53.05</u>	\$120,685,689	<u>52%</u>
Total skier expenditures	\$102.56	\$233,327,461	100%

¹Average resort operator revenue per skier visit is for Midwestern ski resorts, as reported in the 2009/10 Economic Analysis of United States Ski Areas (NSAA). Data is for winter operations only, and has been inflation-adjusted to 2010/11 dollars based on the Consumer Price Index for the Midwest Region.

• <u>Direct, secondary and total output effects</u>: Table 4 to follow illustrates the estimated direct, secondary, and total output effects attributable to skiing in Wisconsin. Direct output, estimated at \$187 million, is calculated by multiplying skier expenditures by 0.8 (a generalized adjustment factor which reflects typical retailer margins). This step is necessary to omit the cost of goods sold which are made outside of Wisconsin, and thus appropriately reflect the economic output captured in Wisconsin.

Secondary ("multiplier") economic effects, as defined earlier, are roughly estimated at \$131 million. Secondary effects are calculated by multiplying direct output by 0.7, a factor which is also based on national averages in the tourism industry.

Total output attributable to skiing is estimated as the sum of direct and secondary effects, or approximately \$317 million.

Table 4
Direct, Secondary, and Total Output Effects Attributable to Skiing in Wisconsin 2010/11

	Aggregate Effect
Total skier expenditures	\$233,327,461
Direct output ratio (margin adjustment)	0.8
Direct output effect	\$186,661,969
Secondary output ratio	
Secondary output effect	\$130,663,378
Total output (direct and secondary)	\$317,325,347

Note: Direct output ratio (0.8) and secondary output ratio (0.7) are approximate averages for visitor spending effects at the statewide level of geography, as cited as by Stynes, D.J. (2010), as quoted in Crompton, J.L. (2010), *Measuring the Economic Impact of Park and Recreation Services*, National Recreation and Park Association, Ashburn, VA, p. 37. Actual ratios in Wisconsin may differ from these averages.

Employment and Income Effects of Skiing

As illustrated in Table 5 below, approximately 6,300 jobs in Wisconsin are estimated to be directly or indirectly attributable to skier expenditures. This calculation utilizes a generalized ratio of 20 jobs per \$1 million in output, based on rough national norms.

Additionally, skiing in Wisconsin is estimated to directly or indirectly generate approximately \$110 million in income. This calculation uses a generalized income to sales ratio of 35 percent, again based on approximate national norms.

Table 5
Number of Jobs Attributable to Direct Skier Expenditures in Wisconsin 2010/11

	Direct effect	Secondary effect	Total effect
Sales (output)	\$186,661,969	\$130,663,378	\$317,325,347
Jobs / \$1M in sales (approx.)	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>
Jobs	3,733	2,613	6,347
Sales (output)	\$186,661,969	\$130,663,378	\$317,325,347
Income:sales ratio (approx.)	<u>35%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>35%</u>
Income	\$65,331,689	\$45,732,182	\$111,063,871

Note: Jobs:sales ratio and income:sales ratio are approximate national averages for rough estimation purposes, as cited as by Stynes, D.J. (2010), as quoted in Crompton, J.L. (2010), *Measuring the Economic Impact of Park and Recreation Services*, National Recreation and Park Association, Ashburn, VA, p. 37. Actual ratios in Wisconsin may differ from these averages.



EDWARD J. VOPAL

PRESIDENT

GREEN BAY

Jeffrey A. Pitman
President-Elect
Milwaukee

Christopher D. Stombaugh Vice-President

PLATTEVILLE

ANN S. JACOBS
SECRETARY

MILWAUKEE

RUSSELL T. GOLLA
TREASURER

J. MICHAEL END PAST PRESIDENT MILWAUKEE

STEVENS POINT

JANE E. GARROTT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Testimony of Edward Vopal on behalf of the Wisconsin Association for Justice

Senate Judiciary, Utilities, Commerce, and Government Operations Committee Senator Zipperer, Chair

2011 Senate Bill 388 February 8, 2012

My name is Edward Vopal. I am a partner in the Habush, Habush & Rottier, S.C. law firm in Green Bay, Wisconsin and the President of the Wisconsin Association for Justice (WAJ). Thank you for the opportunity to testify against Senate Bill (SB-388).

I. Wisconsin's Constitution and a Right to a Remedy

First, WAJ generally opposes immunity in any form. Access to the courts and trial by jury are recognized as fundamental rights in our society. There is no question that the Founding Fathers all explicitly said that citizens have the right to have their claims against their neighbors heard by a jury of their peers. It's mentioned in the Declaration of Independence and it is found in the 7th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Wisconsin Constitution recognized this right in Article I, §5, which guarantees that the right to a jury trial shall remain inviolate. "The public policy of the state ... is determined by the constitution so far as jury trials are concerned, and the legislature is not permitted to circumvent the constitutional provision in order to even secure a better public policy. That can only be done by constitutional amendment." La Bowe v. Balthazor, 180 Wis. 419, 423, 193 N.W. 244 (1923).

Wisconsin courts have long recognized the importance of a litigant's right to a remedy. Article I, Section 9 of the Wisconsin Constitution provides: "Every person is entitled to a certain remedy in the laws for all injuries or wrongs which he may receive in his person, property, or character; he ought to obtain justice freely without being obliged to purchase it, completely and

without denial, promptly and without delay, comformably to the laws." While the provision does not confer any rights per se, it does ensure a remedy when an injury results from violation of a legal right.

II. SB-388 Provides Ski Area Operators with Immunity

Immunity bills such as SB-388, however, eliminate the right to trial by jury and limit access to justice, no matter the facts involved, to an injured person and his or her family. The growing push for immunity, via legislation, represents a major threat to our system of civil justice and any concept of accountability.

WAJ does not believe this bill is about skier safety, as the proponents will argue. SB-388 is first and foremost about placing the burden of certain risks or dangers on skiers, rather than ski area operators thereby relieving ski area operators of responsibility for creating and enhancing risks.

Wisconsin already provides rules for participants of recreational activities, including skiing. Under *Wis. Stat.* § 895.525, a participant in any recreational activity, including skiing, accepts the *inherent risks* of which the ordinary prudent person is or should be aware; the risks so accepted reduce recovery as if it were comparative negligence under § 895.045. Participants must conduct themselves within their abilities, heed warnings, and generally remain in control so as not to harm themselves or others. A violation of *Wis. Stat.* 895.525(4) constitutes negligence.

SB-388 appears to say that if a skier assumes the risk of skiing, it is a complete bar to recovery if an injury occurs. The bill resurrects the doctrine of "assumption of risk," which Wisconsin abandoned as a complete bar to recovery, as has virtually every state in the country. As noted, Wisconsin uses a comparative negligence system, which demands a reasonable balancing of fault. SB-388 removes all consideration of the ski area's fault and places the entire burden on the skier. This is immunity for the ski area operator.

Immunity laws are a drastic limitation on individual rights because if applied a case is not allowed to proceed, shutting the courthouse door to an injured person. Under current law, a judge and jury may now determine the relative merits of lawsuits. Immunity means no judge could make a ruling on whether a case has merit and should move forward. Moreover, no jury could decide the merits of the case based on its facts.

We think it is important to discuss the inherent risks and conditions of skiing that all skiers – from beginners to those experienced – must accept if SB-388 passes.

SB-388 requires the skier to be able to assess every risk on the slope. This includes risks of the conditions – rocks, boulders and forest growth, including debris, stumps, logs or brush – as well as man-made conditions, like ski area infrastructure or ski area vehicles. One risk that appears especially onerous is "The risk of injury or death on trails and terrains that fall away or drop off toward hazards."

These requirements seem like an impossible duty to meet for beginning skiers. The bill shifts the responsibility for safety away from the ski area operator – who knows the course and understands the risks – to the unknowing beginning skier.

SB-388 does not impose on ski area operators any duty or obligation to safely design a ski area. Ski area operators have expertise concerning hill design, hill conditions, changing snow conditions and knowledge of manmade obstacles that are potentially dangerous.

SB-388 broadens the definition of risks inherent in skiing to include a number of risks created by the ski area itself – the way runs are cut and/or maintained. Ski areas are designed to look natural, like golf courses, when in fact they are "man-made," usually designed by experts in the industry who are fully aware of the risks and hazards associated with skiing.

There are examples of skiers, both novice and experienced, who have been seriously injured because man-made conditions in ski areas have created unreasonable hazards. SB-388 effectively shifts the burden from the ski area operator to the skier to assess and assume potentially unknown risks for use of a ski trail, ski area infrastructure or vehicles, or other conditions operators know could hurt a skier. Yet there are minimal duties to mitigate these dangers. Often the cost of mitigating significant risks in a reasonable fashion would be minimal, such as padding, shielding, or screening, by comparison to potentially significant cost of ski area injuries.

However, mitigation of risk factors by ski area operators seems be contradicted by the language of the bill that requires the "participant in a snow sport at a ski area accepts that natural or *man-made items or obstacles* within a ski area, including *ski area infrastructure and ski area vehicles*, may be unpadded or not heavily padded and *accepts* that there may be a higher risk of injury or death or of a more severe injury associated with a collision with an item or obstacle that is unpadded or not heavily padded." This bill's language seems to mean that ski area operators have no duty to use padding or any sort of screen or shield to mitigate injury and make skiing safer for skiers.

SB-388 lacks meaningful duties on the part of ski area operators or owners to keep skiers safe. The proposed bill requires them to post signs and print on tickets a warning of dangers inherent in snow sports and of the responsibilities each participant has for his or her own safety. Surprisingly, this bill allows ski area operators to vary the statutory signage requirements. It does not require the listing of the conditions each skier assumes; it merely requires that a copy of the law be available. Ski area operators or owners must also place warning signs and informational signs as to the level of difficulty of ski trails. They must also provide maps when they have three or more trails, listing trails and terrain with the level of difficulty. Ski area operators are required to post barriers only to identify freestyle skiing areas. Ski area vehicles must have a flag and flashing light, which is required to flash only when the engine is on. Ski area operators are required to inspect lifts at the ski area *once* a year for compliance with state regulations.

If these minimal duties are met, the bill states, a ski operator "owes no further duty of care to a participant in a snow sport and is not liable for an injury or death that occurs as a result of any condition or risk accepted by the participant..."

What happens if an employee runs down some skiers while drunk? The bill appears to provide both the employee and ski area operator with immunity.

On the ski lift, the bill only requires a yearly inspection. What happens if the ski lift malfunctions? Is there no requirement to repair? What if the malfunction injures skiers, is there no liability?

A potential area of confusion is that the bill makes collisions with other skiers or vehicles a risk of the snow sport, Section 167.33(2)(f). The assumption of risk of another skier's negligence should not be an inherent risk of the activity. This language may negate the provision later in 895.526(4)(b) which provides that "a participant involved in a collision with any other participant or with a nonparticipant may be liable for an injury or death that occurs as a result of the collision." Making a collision an inherent risk while subsequently providing for liability appears contradictory and is confusing. Is a collision an inherent risk that a person assumes or can negligence be claimed? If a negligent skier is liable to another skier for his or her actions, even though they both assumed these statutory risks, why wouldn't the ski area operator also be liable?

III. SB-388 Compared to Colorado and Michigan Ski Laws

The authors of this legislation have intimated that Wisconsin is simply trying to replicate the laws of Colorado and Michigan. Having reviewed the legislation of both states there are some significant differences.

Colorado has several additional duties for ski area operators including marking hydrants, water pipes and all other man-made structures on slopes or trails and appropriately covering them with shock-absorbent materials to lessen injuries. The state has a list of signs that operators must post. As a passenger riding a tramway (ski lift), the ski area operator is required to inspect them daily for the presence and visibility of signs. A skier is not allowed to leave the vicinity of a collision with another skier when an injury results unless they provide their name and address to the ski patrol. Finally, Colorado's law clearly provides that if a ski area operator violates the statute, it is negligence.

Michigan has created a Ski Area Safety Board, which makes rules for safe construction, installation, repair, use, operation, maintenance and inspection for the protection of the general public while using ski area and ski lifts. Michigan also appears to require more markings to man-made objects, like hydrants. Michigan requires notice to the public if snow-making operations are occurring. Michigan also requires that a skier who causes an injury to another to immediately notify the ski patrol, if able. A failure to report could result in the skier being guilty of a misdemeanor. Michigan law also provides that a skier or ski area operator, who violates their laws, can be found liable for the damages.

IV. SB-388 Authorizes the Enforcement of Exculpatory Releases

Finally, one of the major differences in the legislation is the inclusion of language authorizing the use and enforcement of exculpatory releases. Exculpatory releases generally require any person who signs them to acknowledge they understand their rights, waive them, and agree not to hold another responsible for an injury. In essence, a person is asked to sign away his or her rights without any meaningful opportunity to know and appreciate the risks involved. In fact, this bill would apply to children when parents, a legal guardian or "other person" authorized by the parents or legal guardian, sign the release.

Wisconsin law does not favor exculpatory releases (liability waivers). While the Wisconsin Supreme Court has not held that an exculpatory clause (liability waiver) is invalid per se, they have held that such a release must be strictly construed against the party seeking to rely on it. Some of the

exculpatory releases the Courts have reviewed were overly broad and barred specific causes of action, like reckless or intentional behavior. So if the ski area had a duty to act under the bill, a person signing an exculpatory release could not hold an owner liable even if it had failed to meet its obligations under SB-388.

In *Yauger v. Skiing Enterprises, Inc.*, 206 Wis.2d 76, 557 N.W.2d 60 (1996), a skier fatally collided with the unpadded concrete base of a chair lift tower. The court held that the contract was against public policy because it referred only to the "inherent risks of skiing" and did not mention that the waiver relieved the defendant from its own negligence. Will this release be made valid by the passage of SB-388?

If SB-388 validates all exculpatory releases, regardless of the language of the release or circumstances of the case, it would contradict decades of Wisconsin jurisprudence. The bill does not include language that must be included in an exculpatory release. Will there be language so that the person knows and is aware of risks such as the negligent or intentional acts of a ski area operator? Will the person be allowed to negotiate the exculpatory release?

The exculpatory release would effectively render meaningless the ski area operators obligations under this proposed bill.

WAJ strongly disagrees with the inclusion of language allowing the use of exculpatory releases in Wisconsin.

Creation of a statutory immunity is the single most draconian step the Legislature can take to address a liability issue. Only important public policy considerations can ever justify a grant of immunity, because immunity shields negligent conduct. Clearly, immunity ought to be reserved for only very extraordinary circumstances. WAJ does not believe ski area operators deserve that exulted status of immunity.

Thank you.

HighBeam"

skiing fatality wisconsin

Follow us:

Subscription

8987ch

Sign up for a free, 7-day trial

Publications

Reset

Publications home

Journals

Magazines

Newspapera

Reference works and books

Home » Publications » U.S. newspapers and newswires » Wisconsin newspapers » The Capital Times » March 2003 »

Recently viewed: Article: SKIING ACCIDENT KILLS ILLINOIS TEEN IT'S THE SECOND SKIING DEATH IN...

Save

Export

Emali

Print

Clte

THREE SKI DEATHS WITHIN A MONTH STIR UP CONCERNS HMONG FAMILY SHEDS MANY TEARS. (FRONT)

The Capital Times

The Capital Times

March 10, 2003 | Derby, Samara Kalk | Copyright

0

Like

Tweet 0

Permalink

Byline: Samara Kalk Derby The Capital Times

Family members and friends stood and cried over the casket of 19-year-old Bao Vang all day Saturday and Sunday.

In Hmong tradition, the more the tears, the greater the chance Bao will be reincarnated, a family member explained as she sat in a side room at the Sanfillippo-Cress Funeral Home on University Avenue. Mourning took place from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. both days.

Bao died an hour or so after a ski accident March 1 at Tyrol Basin ski area in Mount Horeb. It was her second time **skiing**.

"It's just a shock," said Bao's brother Yey Vang, 26, suggesting that maybe local ski hills should require new skiers to take a class where they learn to fall before they are allowed out on the runs.

"We would like to see something done over there, so people ...

To read the full text of this article and others like it, try us out for 7 days, FREE!

Related articles

News Wire

Ski areas dreaming of a white Christmas.(Recreation)(Shortage: Local ski areas hope for more snowfall before the weekend.)

The Register Guard (Eugene, OR); December 19, 2002

Just gliding along: The economy's gone downhill, but local ski areas have dumped the frills and the sector slow experienced nary a bump

The Boston Globe (Boston, MA); January 3, 2010

Publication Finder

Browse back issues from our exte more than 6,500 trusted publicatio

Enter a publication name

Ads by Google

Replacement Spa Packs
Replaces Len Gordon, Balboa,
Aqualine, others.
www.SpaGuts.com

5 Foods you must not eat: Cut down a bit of stomach fat en never eating these 5 foods. Beyonddiet.com

Popular publications on HighBeam Research

The Washington Post Washington D.C. newspapers

The Christian Science Monitor Religious magazines

Newsweek National newspapers

The Mirror (London, England) U.K. newspapers

Daily Mail (London) U.K. newspapers

Help us improve our w

Become a member of our Cust Panel. Your opinion ma

Join the panel



devils head 14 year old

Search

Sign up for a free, 7-day trial

Publications

⊼६३६१

Publications home

Journals

Magazines

Newspapers

Reference works and books

Home » Publications » U.S. newspapers and newswires » Wisconsin newspapers » The Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI) » March 2003 »

Save

Export

Emall

Print

Cite

Publication Finder

Browse back issues from our exte more than 6,500 trusted publicatio

Enter a publication name

SKIING ACCIDENT KILLS ILLINOIS TEEN IT'S THE SECOND SKIING DEATH IN WISCONSIN IN LESS THAN A WEEK.(LOCAL/WISCONSIN)



The Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI)

March 7, 2003 | Copyright

0

Like

Tweet 0

Parmalink

Byline: Baraboo News Republic

MERRIMAC -- A 14-year-old Illinois boy died Tuesday after a skiing accident.

It's the second skiing death in less than a week in southern Wisconsin.

Benjamin Smith of Bolingbrook, Ill., died Tuesday at UW Hospital after an accident Sunday at Devil's **Head** Ski Resort.

According to the Sauk County Sheriff's Department, a witness saw Benjamin skiing straight down a hill marked most difficult, without going side to side. The witness said he saw Benjamin go over the edge of a feature called a half pipe and disappear. Then the witness saw him lying on the ground. He had fallen and struck his **head** at about 1:20 p.m. ...

To read the full text of this article and others like it, try us out for 7 days, FREE!

Ads by Google

Hot South American Girls Browse 1000s Quality Profiles f Real People! AmoLatina.com

Online Job Applications
Find The Job You Want & Apply
Today! Find Applications Now
www.careerguru.com/apply-onlin

Popular publications on HighBeam Research

The Washington Post Washington D.C. newspapers

Daily Mail (London) U.K. newspapers

The Christian Science Monitor Religious magazines

The Mirror (London, England) U.K. newspapers

The Economist (US) Political magazines

Help us improve our w

Become a member of our Cust Panel. Your opinion ma

Join the panel

Related articles

on HighBeam Research



UW HOSPITAL TELLS 53 OF FATAL DISEASE RISK PATIENT DIED OF RARE BRAIN DISEASE AFTER OPERATION STERLIZATION OF SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS AT ISSUE.(FRONT) The Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI); July 24, 2009



MAN KILLED IN CRASH WAS FROM MARSHALL HE DIED TUESDAY NIGHT AFTER HIS CAR COLLIDED WITH A TRUCK ON HIGHWAY 12.(LOCAL/WISCONSIN)(POLICE REPORT)(Column) The Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI); January 17, 2002



FARM ACCIDENT KILLS 10-YEAR-OLD BOY (LOCAL/WISCONSIN)
The Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI); May 8, 2003



MOUNT HOREB MAN DIES WHEN TRACTOR ROLLS.(LOCAL)
The Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI): August 5, 2009